

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed February 24, 2005.

A. Claims

Claims 1-50 have been cancelled. Claims 51-74 have been added. Claims 51-74 are currently pending.

B. 35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-50 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as “failing to comply with the written description requirement.” Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections, however, as claims 1-50 have been cancelled, the rejection is believed moot.

C. Specification

The Examiner objected under 35 U.S.C. §132 to the amendment filed on April 12, 2004 “because it introduces new matter into the disclosure.” Applicant respectfully disagrees, however, because the claim terms at issue have ample support in the specification without the amendments, the Applicant has taken out these amendments objected to by the Examiner.

D. 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Choksi

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 12-49 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,477,243 B1 to Choksi et al. (hereinafter “Choksi”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections, however, as claims 1-50 have been cancelled, the rejection is believed moot.

Applicant also respectfully notes that Choksi does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “reviewing the recorded audio data” and “wherein the recorded audio data is reviewed prior to being accessible by the computer system” as recited in claims 51, 71,

and 72. Claim 73 recites, among others, a similar limitation not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Choksi.

Applicant also respectfully notes that Choksi does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “accessing a location profile of the location, wherein the location profile comprises a requirement for audio data to be posted at the location; modifying the recorded audio data to conform to the requirement in the location profile” as recited in claim 61.

Applicant also respectfully notes that Choksi does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “presenting the audio file to the user for approval” as recited in claim 74.

Applicant respectfully asserts claims 51, 61, 71, 72, 73, 74, and claims dependent thereon are allowable for at least the above reasons.

Bobo and Acharya

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9, 13-19, 22-43, and 48-50 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,675,507 to Bobo, II (hereinafter “Bobo”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,408,296 B1 to Acharya et al. (hereinafter “Acharya”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections, however, as claims 1-50 have been cancelled, the rejection is believed moot.

Applicant also respectfully notes that BoBo and Acharya do not disclose, teach, or suggest, either separately or in combination, at least “reviewing the recorded audio data” and “wherein the recorded audio data is reviewed prior to being accessible by the computer system” as recited in claims 51, 71, and 72. Claim 73 recites, among others, a similar limitation not disclosed, taught, or suggested by BoBo and Acharya.

Applicant also respectfully notes that BoBo and Acharya do not disclose, teach, or suggest, either separately or in combination, at least “accessing a location profile of the location, wherein the location profile comprises a requirement for audio data to be posted at the location; modifying the recorded audio data to conform to the requirement in the location profile” as recited in claim 61.

Applicant also respectfully notes that BoBo and Acharya do not disclose, teach, or suggest, either separately or in combination, at least “presenting the audio file to the user for approval” as recited in claim 74.

Applicant respectfully asserts claims 51, 61, 71, 72, 73, 74, and claims dependent thereon are allowable for at least the above reasons.

Uppaluru

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 8, 17, 20, 22, 30, 37, 48 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,915,001 to Uppaluru (hereinafter “Uppaluru”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections, however, as claims 1-50 have been cancelled, the rejection is believed moot.

Applicant also respectfully notes that Uppaluru does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “reviewing the recorded audio data” and “wherein the recorded audio data is reviewed prior to being accessible by the computer system” as recited in claims 51, 71, and 72. Claim 73 recites, among others, a similar limitation not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Uppaluru.

Applicant also respectfully notes that Uppaluru does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “accessing a location profile of the location, wherein the location profile comprises a requirement for audio data to be posted at the location; modifying the recorded audio data to conform to the requirement in the location profile” as recited in claim 61.

Applicant also respectfully notes that Uppaluru does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “presenting the audio file to the user for approval” as recited in claim 74.

Applicant respectfully asserts claims 51, 61, 71, 72, 73, 74, and claims dependent thereon are allowable for at least the above reasons.

E. New Claims

New claims 51-74 are believed allowable for at least the above reasons.

F. Conclusion

Based on the above, Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5957-02200/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☒ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☒ Request for Continued Examination

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey C. Hood
Reg. No. 35,198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: May 24, 2005 JCH/REH